



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/508,147	03/07/2000	YI SUN	5780-01-TMC	8871

7590 02/09/2004

MICHAEL J ATKINS  
WARNER LAMBERT COMPANY  
2800 PLYMOUTH ROAD  
ANN ARBOR, MI 48105

EXAMINER
----------

WILDER, CYNTHIA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1637

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/508,147	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SUN, YI	
	<b>Examiner</b> Cynthia B. Wilder, Ph.D.	<b>Art Unit</b> 1637	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 27 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☒ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment to advisory action.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 2.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 3.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: see attachment to advisory action

**ATTACHMENT TO ADVISORY ACTION**

1. Applicant's amendment filed on May 27, 2003 is acknowledged and has been entered. Claims 2 and 3 have been amended. Claims 1 and 4 have been cancelled. Claims 2 and 3 are pending in the instant application.

2. The prior art rejections under 35 USC 102(a) directed to claims 2 and 3 as being anticipated by Bian et al. are withdrawn in view of Applicants' Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed on May 27, 2003 is sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 2 and 3 under 35 USC 102(a) based upon Applicants' evidence establishing sole inventorship of the subject matter and reduction to practice of the invention prior to the publication of the prior art.

3. The prior art rejection under 35 USC 102(b) directed to claim 3 as being anticipated by Draper et al is maintained because the new limitation "that binds to the consensus p53 DNA binding site" is an inherent feature or inherent property of the nucleic acid sequence of Draper et al. MPEP 2112.01 states that "where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established". *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). MPEP states that "when the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not". *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In this case, Draper teaches a sequence that is 100% identical to the sequence of SEQ ID NO: 10 (See prior Office action). The binding property of SEQ ID NO: 10 of the instant invention to the consensus p53 binding site is

Art Unit: 1637


an inherent property of the sequence (SEQ ID NO: 4 of Figure 4) of the Draper patent.

Accordingly, the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) directed to claim 3 is maintained.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cynthia B. Wilder, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0791. The examiner works a flexible schedule and can be reached by phone and voice mail. Alternatively, a request for a return telephone call may be emailed to [cynthia.wilder@uspto.gov](mailto:cynthia.wilder@uspto.gov). Since email communications may not be secure, it is suggested that information in such request be limited to name, phone number, and the best time to return the call

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on (703) 308-1119. The official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308 0196.

  
KENNETH R. HORLICK, PH.D  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
2/4/04